Guide to
Academic Program Review
2017-18

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Revised March 14, 2017

University of Houston Clear Lake

Contents

University of Houston ⌇ Clear Lake

GUIDE TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Introduction

The University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) has committed itself to an ongoing, cyclical, comprehensive academic program review (APR) process of its degree programs at all levels: bachelor, master, and doctoral.

Those directly involved in each individual review include the program faculty, the program chair, the program report committee, the college faculty and administration, the college curriculum committee, and the Senior Vice President and Provost. Each has a clearly specified role in the process.

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost has responsibility for general oversight of program review; the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is the APR coordinator on behalf of the Provost's Office.

Definition of a Program

Generally, a *program* is any academic unit offering a collection of related degrees, support areas, concentrations, teaching fields, or certification offerings which a college wishes to group for the review.

A *program* is an academic entity. *Curriculum* is the aggregate courses of study in a program. Thus, for purposes of program review, *program* and *curriculum* are NOT synonymous terms. A program offers at least one curriculum. It also has initial responsibility for the quality of that curriculum, the faculty who offer the curriculum, the students in the curriculum, the resources and facilities supporting the curriculum, and the focus of the program (unit) in all dimensions of its operation.

Purpose of Program Review

Program review is an integral part of the university's overall planning process and usually occurs on a seven-year cycle as set by the university and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). Its purposes are the following:

- To improve program quality in the context of university and college missions; to implement criteria for program approval by the state, national accreditation standards, and guidelines put forth by academic organizations; and to address institutional resource needs and demands.
- To help a program examine itself in its entirety (its focus, faculty, curriculum, students, resources and facilities, and learning outcomes) within a framework that includes its past development and its plans for the future.

- To provide the program with an impartial study of and response to the work presented in the Program Report by informed colleagues outside the program (graduate level only).

Program Review Process

UHCL has aligned both its bachelor and master degree program review process with the regulations established in 2011 by THECB for graduate programs with only one exception: undergraduate programs do not require an external review. All other THECB guidelines apply. UHCL programs must submit separate program reviews for each level of their programs.

Of particular note from the THECB are the following:
- During any given year of a cycle, an institution may review no more than 20 percent of its graduate programs.
- New graduate programs must be reviewed no later than the seventh year after the start date of the program.
- During the seven-year cycle, each program is reviewed using the criteria listed in Rule 5.52 (see Appendix 1). The process must include a programmatic self-study and a review by external consultants with discipline expertise who are employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas. Doctoral programs shall be reviewed by at least two external consultants and master's programs by at least one.
- Programs that are accredited by an external body may use the results of their accreditation review to satisfy the review requirements under Rule 5.52. No additional external review is necessary.

Roles and Responsibilities

Provost
As the university's chief academic officer, the Senior Vice President and Provost acts on behalf of the institution in the following ways:

- Initiates the program review process by sending a letter to the Dean requesting review of programs according to the University's master review schedule and identifying issues of current, general university concern.

- Receives the completed Program Review Report and related documents from the Office of the Dean.

- Conducts an Exit Interview with the Dean, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA), and the program faculty together to discuss the findings of the Program Review Report and Executive Summary.

- Sends to the Dean a written summary of the outcomes of the Exit Interview, including any identified programmatic changes to be made.

Dean
The Dean acts on behalf of the college in the following ways:

- Responds to the Senior Vice President and Provost's request for review of programs according to the university's master review schedule.

- Appoints the Program Report Committee, naming the chair, and notifying the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment.

- Instructs the Program Report Committee to address specific concerns and issues as it carries out its responsibilities.

- Ensures that the Program Report Committee produces the Program Report in a timely fashion.

- Ensures that the college's Curriculum Committee has studied and approved the Program Report.

- Reviews and attests to the accuracy and completeness of the Program Report.

- Sends electronic copies of the Program Report and all relevant materials to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

- Attends the Exit Interview with the Provost, the AVPAA, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, and the program faculty together to discuss the findings of the Program Report and Executive Summary to determine appropriate follow-up as needed.

- Receives the Provost's written summary of the outcomes of that meeting.

- Works with the program faculty, along with other college bodies essential to the process, to address any problems and recommendations ensuing from the review.

Program Report Committee
The college Program Report Committee produces the Program Report. The Dean appoints the chair and members of the committee that produce the Program Review Report. In most cases, the committee will consist of the program faculty, but persons external to the program may also serve.

The duties of the chair are the following:

- Contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to review and discuss the program data as needed.

- Convene all meetings.

- Make work assignments to members.

- Maintain the production schedule within the given time frame.

- Report interim progress to the Dean.

- Contact the Neumann Library (Associate Director for Public Services) for a supporting resource review, including books, journal holdings, Texas and U. S. government documents, specialized microform collections, and electronic databases.

- Oversee the production of the final report.

- Transmit the report to the college Curriculum Committee.

- Respond to the recommendations of the curriculum committee.

- Oversee the production of the response to the External Review.

Committee members are responsible for performing their work assignments in a timely manner, reviewing and revising the compiled document and representing the program at the Exit Interview with the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, and the Dean.

College Curriculum Committee
The college Curriculum Committee acts on behalf of the faculty of the college in ensuring that the Program Report meets college standards and expectations and is ready for presentation to the Dean. The signature of the chair attests to the Curriculum Committee's official approval of the Program Report.

Time Frame

Schedule
All programs will undergo review on the established seven-year cycle. Information on which years each program will be reviewed may be found in the approved Program Review Schedule maintained by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. When feasible, the program reviews may coincide with state approval and/or national accreditation review

Length of Process
The program review process should be completed in 17 months. It commences with the Senior Vice President and Provost's notification to the Deans, no later than March 15 of the calendar year before the review is to conclude, and ends with the formal college/program Exit Interview.

Time Line
The time line over the 17-month period provides open periods of time during which various activities may be completed; however, programs and colleges should maintain the schedule and provide information or materials by the dates specified. The Dean or a designee should inform the Executive Director of OIE of delays or significant deviation from the time line.

Program Review Time Line

First Calendar Year	
March 1-15	On behalf of the Provost, the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment sends letters to Deans identifying programs due for review.
March 15-30	Deans appoint the Program Report Committees, name the chairs, and notify the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Executive Director of Planning and Assessment of those appointments.
April 1-30	OIE provides program level data to the colleges.
April-October	Program Report Committee meets, assigns responsibilities, and writes draft.
August 31	Colleges request stipends for external reviewers through the Provost's Office by August 31.
November 1-30	The Program Report Committee presents draft to college's Curriculum Committee and makes changes, if any, as directed.
December 1	The Program Review Committee presents approved report to the Dean.
December 15	The Dean or designee submits the internal Program Report—graduate and undergraduate—to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for review and forwarding to the Provost.
Second Calendar Year	
January	Dean or designee sends graduate program review to external reviewer(s).
February/March 31	Upon receiving the external review, the Dean or designee writes response to comments by external reviewer and submits both the external review and the response to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
April -July	The Provost's Office sets up Exit Interviews with the Provost, AVPAA, Executive Director of Planning and Assessment, Dean, and Program Report Committee/Faculty.
April-July	The Executive Director of Planning and Assessment sends the Provost's summary of the Exit Interview to the Dean.
August 31	OIE must submit all graduate program reviews to the THECB by this date.

Report Content for Bachelor and Master Level Program Reviews

The following structure will guide you in completing the program review report for bachelor degree and master degree programs.

I. **Front Matter**
   The Program Report begins with a cover sheet followed by a table of contents, list of tables, and an executive summary.

   A. **Cover Sheet**
      The cover sheet contains the names of the program, the program chair, and the college, as well as the date on which the program began. It must also include the signatures of the Program Report Committee chair, the College Curriculum Committee chair, and the Dean, along with the dates those signatures were affixed. Finally, it must contain spaces for the signatures of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Senior Vice President and Provost and for the dates when they sign the document. See sample cover sheet in Appendix 2.

   B. **Table of Contents**
      For easy reference, please provide a table of contents to at least the second level of headings.

   C. **List of Tables**
      If you include four or more tables or charts within your report, please provide a list of tables.

   D. **Executive Summary**
      The executive summary should be a 1-2 page document that provides a condensed version of the content in your report. Include major findings from each section of the body and identify key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats revealed in the program review.

II. **Main Content**
   The narrative should follow these guidelines for the introduction, body, and conclusion and should not exceed more than 50 pages.

   A. **Introduction**
      The introduction includes information that readers need from the outset to understand special factors that have a profound influence on the program. Examples might be national accreditation standards, state program approval guidelines, certification requirements, and the date of the program's initiation.

   B. **Body**
      The body of the Program Report is to be organized in sections with each section set off by appropriate titles, as follows:
      Program Focus
      Curriculum
      Faculty
      Students
      Resources and Facilities
      Learning Outcomes

To help the Program Report Committee address the six areas of program, curriculum, faculty, students, resources and facilities, and learning outcomes, this *Guide to Program Review* includes several "focus" statements for each category. These focus statements point at important elements of each section and may serve as an outline for preparing the body of the report. In addition, measures mandated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in 2011 are indicated with the data source; the letter in parentheses corresponds to the list of the THECB's Mandatory Data. These data should be analyzed within the narrative when possible. You will provide a full copy of all mandated data in your Program Report's Appendix A as provided to your colleges by OIE; you should use abbreviated tables and charts within the body of the narrative. You may use other data as necessary.

Program Focus
1. Define program purposes and explain how these purposes implement the mission of the university and the college.
2. Relate service or outreach activities, such as consulting, centers, or institutes, to program purposes. Also include areas of internal service.
3. Discuss the integration of the program with other programs.

   THECB Mandatory Data:
   (S) Program administration, Data Source: Colleges

Curriculum
1. Describe the curriculum and its organization, relating it to the purpose of the program. (You may attach catalog copy. Update the copy if it is inaccurate.)
2. Describe admissions, exit standards, and other programmatic requirements, and provide the rationale for each.
3. Describe how the program evaluates the curriculum and how this information is integrated in future planning.

   THECB Mandatory Data:
   (P) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs, Data Source: Colleges

Faculty
1. Identify faculty involved with the program and describe their roles and activities.
2. Explain whether there is sufficient faculty to support the program.
3. Identify the program faculty chair/coordinator and describe that individual's role.
4. Justify faculty educational backgrounds and experiences as they relate to the courses taught.
5. Include the proportion of tenured, untenured and adjunct faculty, and ethnic and gender make-up.
6. Describe the use of Teaching Assistants, Instructional Assistants, and Research Assistants for instruction, if applicable.
7. Describe faculty development needs and opportunities.
8. Identify professional associations and activities.
9. Identify continuing education activities.

   THECB Mandatory Data
   (A) Faculty qualifications, Data Source: Colleges (Vitae)

(B) Faculty publications, Data Source: Colleges (i.e., Digital Measures)
(C) Faculty external grants, Data Source: Office of Sponsored Programs
(D) Faculty teaching load, Data Source: OIE
(E) Faculty/student ratio, Data Source: OIE

Students
1. Discuss student recruitment and program enrollment management.
2. Describe the student population (percentage of new and returning students, percentage of internationals, gender, ethnicity, full-time or part-time, etc) and state how the program meets the specific needs of these students (on campus, off campus, weekend, and cohort programs, etc.)
3. Describe how new students are oriented into the program, how their academic progress is tracked, and how academic advising is provided.
4. Discuss student performance, including measurement of student gains, such as entrance and exit measurements. Discuss how this information is used in program planning.

   THECB Mandatory Data
   (F) Student demographics, Data Source: OIE
   (G) Student time-to-degree, Data Source: OIE
   (H) Student publication and awards, Data Source: Colleges
   (I) Student retention rates, Data Source: OIE
   (J) Student graduation rates, Data Source: OIE
   (K) Student enrollment, Data Source: OIE
   (L) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable), Data Source: Colleges
   (M) Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training), Data Source: Surveys
   (N) Number of degrees conferred annually, Data Source: OIE

Resources and Facilities
1. Discuss the use of financial resources generated by the program, such as course fees, conference proceeds, and grant funds, if applicable.
2. Examine the adequacy of library and information resources. Cite specific strengths and challenges. Discuss findings from supporting resource review with the Neumann Library Associate Director for Public Services including books, journal holdings, Texas and U. S. government documents, specialized microform collections, and electronic databases.
3. Describe needs for classroom space, laboratories, training facilities and equipment.
4. Review adequacy of staff support services.

   THECB Mandatory Data
   (Q) Program facilities and equipment, Data Source: Colleges
   (R) Program finance and resources, Data Source: Colleges

Learning Outcomes
1. Discuss the knowledge and skills that students have mastered as a result of this program.
2. Discuss specific changes that the program has made to improve student learning, based on assessment findings.
3. If a professional program, discuss employer evaluations of graduates of the program.
4. Discuss the responses of alumni of the program on surveys.
5. If applicable, discuss the performance of program graduates on licensing exams.

THECB Mandatory Data
(O) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes:
Source – Colleges (Assessment plans)

C. Conclusion

The conclusion serves as the capstone of the program's review of itself. Most program report committees will probably choose to address the questions in order, but some may find a different order will suit the needs of their report.

1. How has the program changed since the last program review and how have these changes affected the quality of the program as well as the students and faculty in the program?
2. How is the information collected in the annual plan used in planning and assessing the program?
3. Where should the program go in the next five years? Why? How? As dependent on what resources?

III.   Report Appendices

Two appendices are required to support the report.

APR Report Appendix A: Mandatory Data

The data collection will be based on the academic year. Each year's data will be made available to the UHCL community by the OIE or other office designated by the Provost, and should be included and referenced as appendices to support the narrative; for example, the program review narrative should integrate relevant data wherever appropriate. The complete data should be placed in Appendix A as a whole.

Mandatory Data by THECB
(A)   Faculty qualifications, *Data Source: Colleges (Vitas)*
(B)   Faculty publications, *Data Source: Colleges*
(C)   Faculty external grants, *Data Source: Office of Sponsored Programs*
(D)   Faculty teaching load, *Data Source: OIE*
(E)   Faculty/student ratio, *Data Source: OIE*
(F)   Student demographics, *Data Source: OIE*
(G)   Student time-to-degree, *Data Source: OIE*
(H)   Student publication and awards, *Data Source: Colleges*
(I)   Student retention rates, *Data Source: OIE*
(J)   Student graduation rates, *Data Source: OIE*
(K)   Student enrollment, *Data Source: OIE*
(L)   Graduate licensure rates (if applicable), *Data Source: Colleges*
(M)   Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training), *Data Source: Surveys*
(N)   Number of degrees conferred annually, *Data Source: OIE*
(O)   Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes: *Data Source: Colleges (3 years of assessment plans may be pulled from Taskstream's AMS)*
(P)   Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs, *Data Source: Colleges*
(Q)   Program facilities and equipment, *Data Source: Colleges*
(R)   Program finance and resources, *Data Source: Colleges*
(S)   Program administration: *Sources - Colleges*

APR Appendix B: Previous Review Activities
The documents from the previous review of the program should provide useful information in constructing the new program report, especially in the final section. These documents should include the program report, the narrative summary or dean's executive summary, the provost's written summary of the outcomes of the exit interview with the dean and program faculty, and the college/program follow-up report. The new program report may be considered an update of the previous one. Over time, program reports should provide a useful history of the program.

APR Additional Appendices:
Additional appendices may be used as needed to accurately portray the results of the program review.

Additional Documents for the Master Level Program Review only

External Review
As stipulated by Rule 5.52, graduate programs must provide an external review at the time of the submission of the program review report. External reviewers must have discipline expertise, be employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas, and confirm they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review. Based on the program review report provided by the program, external reviewers should provide an analysis ranging from 2-5 pages in length which addresses the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement in the program. Stipends for external reviewers are available through the Provost's Office and must be requested by August 31.

Response to External Review
The Dean or a designee is to provide the college's response to the external evaluation, noting plans, if any, to address the report's findings.

Report Format and Submission

Format Recommendations
- Use a readable font, such as Times-Roman 12 pt.
- Use minimal graphs and tables within the body of the paper. Since you will include all mandatory data in Appendix A, your visuals should be used to supplement the narrative.

Report Submission
Please submit electronic files to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

For undergraduate reports, please submit one electronic file of the program review.
- File 1: Program Review Report

For graduate reports, please submit three files.
- File 1: Program Review Report
- File 2: External Review
- File 3: Response to External Review

Glossary of Terms

Curriculum
The aggregate courses of study in a program.

Exit Interview
Meeting of the Dean, the AVPAA, and the program faculty with the Provost to discuss findings of the Program Report and the Executive Summary, with special attention to concerns, problems, and recommendations.

Executive Summary
A 1-2 page written summary submitted to the Provost by the Dean or Program Report Committee summarizing the report and program issues.

External Review
An analysis ranging from 2-5 pages in length which addresses the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement in the program.

External Review, Response to
The college's response to the external evaluation, noting plans, if any, to address the report's findings; written by the Dean or a designee.

External Reviewer
A subject-matter expert who is part of a program nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline and who is employed by an institution outside of Texas to review the Program Review report of a graduate program. Reviewers will be paid a stipend and will be provided with materials and products of the program review. They may be brought to campus for an on-site review or may be asked to conduct a remote desk review. External reviewers must affirm they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

Learning Outcomes
Knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors to be exhibited by students after Outcomes program completion.

Master Program Review Schedule
The official roster of programs by year in which they undergo program review, developed and maintained by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Program
Any academic unit offering a collection of related degrees, support areas, concentrations, teaching fields, or certification offerings which a college wishes to group for a sixth-year review.

Program Report
The document that presents the results of the serious thinking the program has done about itself, its direction, and its future. It addresses the categories for review and follows the guidelines and format published in the Guide to Program Review for its preparation.

Program Report Committee
The body appointed by the Dean to produce the Committee Program Report.

Appendix 1: Texas Administrative Code 5.52

Texas Administrative Code

TITLE 19	EDUCATION
PART 1	TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
CHAPTER 5	RULES APPLYING TO PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND/OR SELECTED PUBLIC COLLEGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS
SUBCHAPTER C	APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, HEALTH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, AND REVIEW OF EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS
RULE §5.52	Review of Existing Degree Programs

(a) In accordance with the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, each public institution of higher education shall have a process to review the quality and effectiveness of existing degree programs and for continuous improvement.

(b) The Coordinating Board staff shall develop a process for conducting a periodic audit of the quality, productivity, and effectiveness of existing bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs at public institutions of higher education and health-related institutions.

(c) Each public university and health-related institution shall review all doctoral programs at least once every seven years.

  (1) On a schedule to be determined by the Commissioner, institutions shall submit a schedule of review for all doctoral programs to the Assistant Commissioner of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research.

  (2) Institutions shall begin each review of a doctoral program with a rigorous self-study.

  (3) As part of the required review process, institutions shall use at least two external reviewers with subject-matter expertise who are employed by institutions of higher education outside of Texas.

  (4) External reviewers must be provided with the materials and products of the self-study and must be brought to the campus for an on-site review.

  (5) External reviewers must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

  (6) External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

  (7) Closely-related programs, defined as sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code, may be reviewed in a consolidated manner at the discretion of the institution.

  (8) Institutions shall review master's and doctoral programs in the same discipline simultaneously, using the same self-study materials and reviewers. Institutions may also, at their discretion, review bachelor's programs in the same discipline as master's and doctoral programs simultaneously.

  (9) Criteria for the review of doctoral programs must include, but are not limited to:

    (A) The 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs;

    (B) Student retention rates;

    (C) Student enrollment;

(D) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);

(E) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;

(F) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;

(G) Program facilities and equipment;

(H) Program finance and resources;

(I) Program administration; and

(J) Faculty Qualifications.

(10) Institutions shall submit a report on the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewers and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.

(11) Institutions may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.

(d) Each public university and health-related institution shall review all stand-alone master's programs at least once every seven years.

(1) On a schedule to be determined by the Commissioner, institutions shall submit a schedule of review for all master's programs to the Assistant Commissioner of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research.

(2) Institutions shall begin each review of a master's program with a rigorous self-study.

(3) As part of the required review process, institutions shall use at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution of higher education outside of Texas.

(4) External reviewers shall be provided with the materials and products of the self-study. External reviewers may be brought to the campus for an on-site review or may be asked to conduct a remote desk review.

(5) External reviewers must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

(6) External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

(7) Closely-related programs, defined as sharing the same 4-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code, may be reviewed in a consolidated manner at the discretion of the institution.

(8) Master's programs in the same 6-digit Classification of Instructional Programs code as doctoral programs shall be reviewed simultaneously with their related doctoral programs.

(9) Criteria for the review of master's programs must include, but are not limited to:

(A) Faculty qualifications;

(B) Faculty publications;

(C) Faculty external grants;

(D) Faculty teaching load;

(E) Faculty/student ratio;

(F) Student demographics;

(G) Student time-to-degree;

(H) Student publication and awards;

(I) Student retention rates;

(J) Student graduation rates;

(K) Student enrollment;

(L) Graduate licensure rates (if applicable);

(M) Graduate placement (i.e. employment or further education/training);

(N) Number of degrees conferred annually;

(O) Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes;

(P) Program curriculum and duration in comparison to peer programs;

(Q) Program facilities and equipment;

(R) Program finance and resources; and

(S) Program administration.

(10) Institutions shall submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the external reviewer(s) and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, and shall deliver these reports to the Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research Division no later than 180 days after the reviewer(s) have submitted their findings to the institution.

(11) Institutions may submit reviews performed for reasons of programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the review and reporting requirements in this subsection.

(e) The Coordinating Board shall review all reports submitted for master's and doctoral programs and shall conduct analysis as necessary to ensure high quality. Institutions may be required to take additional actions to improve their programs as a result of Coordinating Board review.

Source Note: The provisions of this §5.52 adopted to be effective August 26, 2009, 34 TexReg 5678; amended to be effective November 29, 2010, 35 TexReg 10496; amended to be effective May 24, 2011, 36 TexReg 3183; amended to be effective August 15, 2013, 38 TexReg 5063

HOME | TEXAS REGISTER | TEXAS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE | OPEN MEETINGS

Appendix 2: Sample Cover Sheet

UHCL PROGRAM REVIEW

Name of Program	
Beginning Date of Program	
Program Chair	
College	
Dean	

SIGNATURES:

Program Review Chair _____Date_____

College Curriculum Committee Chair_____Date_____

Dean_____Date_____

Received by __

Associate VP-Academic Affairs_____Date_____

Revised August 2016

Program Review Checklist

To ensure you are submitting a complete report, please use the following checklist.

- ☐ Cover sheet is complete and signed appropriately.

- ☐ Table of contents is clear and adequate.

- ☐ List of tables is clear and adequate.

- ☐ Executive Summary is 1-2 pages in length and includes major findings from each section of the report.

- ☐ Introduction provides overview of report.

- ☐ Body of report discusses six major areas of self-study.

- ☐ Program addresses all three of the focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Curriculum addresses all three of the focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Faculty section addresses most of the nine focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Students section addresses the four focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Resources and Facilities section addresses the four focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Learning Outcomes section addresses the five focus statements and supports analysis with relevant tables or visuals.

- ☐ Conclusion discusses the path the program has taken since the last program review and provides a path forward for excellence.

- ☐ Appendix A includes the THECB Mandatory Data. Some mandatory data may be combined (A vita, for example, could be used for faculty qualifications and publications; an OIE data report will have several data points.)

- ☐ Appendix B includes the previous program review report.

- ☐ All appendix items are clearly marked or labeled.

For questions or help, please contact:
Pat Cuchens, Executive Director of Planning and Assessment
Office of Institutional Effectiveness
cuchens@uhcl.edu or 281-283-3065